12

Filed July 1st

by

Mr Maxwell

"The Superintendent of the N. Orleans Br. Mint receiv-
=ed a report on assay pieces sent from this mint; from the
Director in June 1838, which induced me to believe
that errors in assaying had been made by Dr Hort;
& I was confirmed in that opinion from some experiments
made by me about that time: Being requested by
the Superintendent to bring up my accounts, I reported
to him as follows:

"David Bradford Esq.
Superintendent N.O.M. Sir,

I rec.d a lot of silver contain
=ing gold from the Treasurer of the Mint, which has proven from
reassays to have been erroneously reported, & as you request me to render
a statement of my a/c.s by the 1st July, I am under the necessity of
returning it to the Treasurer that the error may be corrected.
The deposite was by Lizardi & Co on the 12th April, consisting of bars or pigs of
silver marked as containing gold, - The three first numbers were cast in the
mould for the quarter eagles, the last no. into two bars. - The assays were
taken after melting & reported as follows. No 51 Silver 984 Gold 14 - No 52
998 Silver - No 53-990 Silver 8 gold - No 54. 984 Silver 14 gold -
No 51 & 53 were rolled for separation, about one third of No 53 has been separated
& all of 54 which was from the same pot with No 51 & corresponded accordingly.
From some experiments I made on No 51 I concluded that there was a mistake in
the assay: I gave the assayer No 51 marked no 1 & 53 marked no 2 he
reported as follows - No 51 (1) Silver 976 Gold 6
53 (2) do 980 " 6

After I had reported as above Mr Bradford received
from me a part of a rolled ingot from each of the melts
numbered 51 & 53 and an ingot from No 52 - He
gave Dr Hort assay pieces from these ingots several
times, without informing him as to the melts from
which they were taken, and I believe he returned
different reports in most cases, and it was not
until it was made known to him from which
melts the assay pieces were taken that he gave a
report corresponding to the original return on

No 51 & 53 and reported no 52 as containing ozs 8. 698 gold. I cannot believe that Dr Hort assayed for silver the melts no. 51, 52, 53 & 54 when first reported — The discrepancy between the report of the assayer of the principal mint & that of the assayer of the N.O. Mint is very great: and the subsequent assays by Dr Hort of this deposite of bullion are as great: As these four melts are returned at an average of 998 milliums — And on subsequent assays were found to vary so much - & One melt reported to contain ozs 8. 698 gold which had been returned at 998 of silver it is conclusive to any One acquainted with the principles of assaying that Dr Hort did not assay for silver any of these melts. — The gold found in no 52 was brought into my account on settlement in August with Mr Bradford & the melts no 51 & 53 were returned to the Treasurer at the first assay):
The Superintendent and Assayer Knew this fact, notwithstanding Mr Bradford writes to the Director soon after that the gold ass was correct, and Dr Hort in One of his letters on file, says in substance in remarking on this settlement: to the confusion of the Melter & Refiner the gold ass proved to be correct.

On the 12th of April 1838 I rec.a from the Treasurer 21 melts of silver, in the aggregate amounting to 38930. ozs Standard. reported at an average of 999 — I melted into ingots 19 melts and lost more than one half — The assay pieces from the two last melts were sent to Philad.a & reported 998 & 997 50. — On the 16 May 1838 I rec.d melts no 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 & 68 in which the gold is averaged. — On the 6th July I rec.d 20 melts of silver averaged at 996 in the aggregate amounting to 32,295 ozs, at that time Dr Hort sent me a slip of paper which I believe is on

file,) informing me that a deduction of 2 millieums had been made which is equal to 64 ozs Stand Silver I gave the Docter to understand that I would not countenance any such proceedings in my reply to him & when he called on me in reference to ~~this thing~~ it: I told him all I wanted was correctness in assaying & that there was no law that gave him authority to make deductions. At the same time I informed Mr Bradford of the fact. This deduction (which was for my advantage,) was to make up (as I suppose) for previous errors on the deposite of the 12th of April made by the same individual.

The Docter in One of his letters to Mr Bradford (which is on file) trys to explain away this impropriety by saying, "I had complained that he did not make sufficient allowance for wastage and he thinking my complaint a reasonable one made the deduction. I had no occasion to ask the assayer for wastage. Could I even suppose that he would so far forget himself as to make the allowance. & it is too absurd to think that after having been thus accommodating I should treat the matter as I did.

This averaging of melts is very doubtful & is something new to me in assaying):

The excess of gold is as follows:

Jany 25. 1839	—	(Separation)	excess Ozs	12. 180
Feby 18.	"	"	"	10. 669
April 2.	"	"	"	12. 839
June 3.	"	"	"	8. 075
				43. 763
March 13.	"	(Toughening)	less	7. 825
			Ozs.	35. 938

Most of this excess I believe has been on deposites made before the settlement in August last.

Possible page or pages missing.